



# **Navy and Marine Corps Consensus Position on Amphibious Command Relationships**

**26 January 2001**

**CINCPACFLT**

**COMMARFORLANT**

**FLEETs**

**COMMARFORPAC**

**CINCUSNAVEUR**

**MCCDC**

**CINCLANTFLT**

**PP&O**

**MEFs**

**NWDC**

**OPNAV**

**NAVCENT**



## Road to consensus for JP 3-02

<b>August 2000:</b>	<b>Concept Development Conference</b>
<b>September 2000:</b>	<b>Scenario Development w/ FLTCINCs and MARFORs</b>
<b>October 2000:</b>	<b>Initial Planning Conference</b>
<b>November 2000:</b>	<b>Mid Planning Conference</b>
<b>December 2000:</b>	<b>Final Planning Conference/Rehearsal</b>
<b>January 2001:</b>	<b>Seminar War game</b>
	<b>-Produced Consensus Position</b>
	<b>-White Cell, PAC Cell, LANT Cell</b>



# Consensus Position

**Question 1: Should the JFC normally delegate OPCON of the amphibious forces to a Service or Functional component commander? If so, which component commander?**

**Answer: No. It is not desirable to prescribe a particular command authority**

- Mission dependent
- Provide full spectrum of options
- **Options JFC may pursue:**
  - Delegation of OPCON/TACON authority to Service/Functional Component.
  - Establish a support relationship between
    - Service Component Commands
    - Functional Component Commands
    - Combination of Service/Functional Component Commands
  - Establish subordinate JTF.



# Consensus Position

**Question 2: What factors should be used to determine the supported commander at various points during the amphibious operation?**

**Answer: The following factors should be considerations, but are not all inclusive:**

- Mission
  - Threat
  - Type, phase and duration of operation
  - Command and control capabilities
  - Force capabilities
  - Battlespace assigned
  - Recommendation from subordinate commanders
- **Rationale and insights from the War Game:**
  - The factors should be mission dependent, but the above should be considered in determining the points.



# Consensus Position

**Question 3: Should the command relationship options available to the establishing authority of an amphibious operation include OPCON, Tactical Control (TACON), and support as described in JP 0-2, UNAAF?**

**Answer:**

- **The command relationships options should include all options per JP 0-2, UNAAF.**
- **TACON includes all authority granted under OPCON in JP 0-2 except those items specifically excluded in the definition of TACON.**
- **Supported/Supporting – requires an Establishing Directive with specific responsibilities and the criteria for shifting the relationship between phases/events.**



# Consensus Position

**Question 4: Should the traditional CATF/CLF relationship remain as an option?**

**Answer: CATF/CLF is not a command relationship; CATF and CLF are descriptive titles (Exec Session changed “titles” to terms).**

**Rationale and insights from the War Game:**

- **Recommend the following changes to doctrinal definitions:  
(Exec Session changed “definitions” to terms)**
  - **Amphibious Force: An Amphibious Task Force and a Landing Force together with other forces that are trained, organized, and equipped for amphibious operations**
  - **Amphibious Task Force: A Navy task organization formed to conduct amphibious operations. Together with the Landing Force and other forces constitutes the Amphibious Force.**
  - **Landing Force: A Marine Corps and/or Army task organization formed to conduct amphibious operations. Together with the Amphibious Task Force and other forces constitutes the Amphibious Force.**



# Consensus Position

**Question 5: Should the titles CATF/CLF be revised to reflect the new command relationship options?**

**Answer: No. However, the relationship between CATF and CLF shall be specified in the Initiating Order and/or the Establishing Directive.**

**Rationale and insights from the War Game:**

- CATF and CLF are descriptive titles **(terms)**. Exploration of different command relationships during the War Game confirmed that all three command relationships were viable options.
- They are widely used in NATO and other publications.
- The proposed revised definitions of Amphibious Force, Amphibious Task Force and Landing Force clarify current doctrinal definitions of CATF and CLF as descriptive titles **(terms)**. **(Note: Exec Session changed “titles” to terms).**



# Consensus Position

**Question 6: What should the normal command relationship be? (between CATF and CLF)**

**Answer: Based on the complementary, rather than similar nature and capabilities of the ATF and LF, typically a support relationship is established between the two commanders. It is not the intent, however, to limit the common superior's authority to establish either an OPCON or TACON command relationship as appropriate.**





# **Navy and Marine Corps Consensus Position on Amphibious Command Relationships**

**(Back-up Slides)**



# Consensus Position

## Question #1 Proposed text for JP 3-02 para 4.b, page II-4

**The JFC will organize the amphibious force in such a way as to best accomplish the mission based on the concept of operations.**

**If organizing forces along Service components, the JFC may: establish a support relationship among the Navy Component Commander (NCC) and the Service component commander of the landing force, or delegate OPCON or TACON of the assigned or attached amphibious forces to a Service component.**

**If organizing the joint force with a combination of Service and functional component commands with operational responsibilities, the JFC may:**

**establish a support relationship among the functional components, Service components, or other appropriate commanders, or delegate OPCON or TACON of the assigned or attached amphibious forces to a functional component or Service component commander.**



# Definitions

## **Amphibious Force (DoD and NATO)**

**Current Definition: “1. A naval force and landing force, together with supporting forces that are trained, organized and equipped for amphibious operations. 2. In naval usage, the administrative title of the amphibious type of command of a fleet.”**

**Proposed Definition: “An Amphibious Task Force and a Landing Force together with other forces that are trained, organized, and equipped for amphibious operations.”**



# Definitions

## **Amphibious task force**

**Current Definition: “The task organization formed for the purpose of conducting an amphibious operation. The amphibious task force always includes Navy forces and a landing force, with their organic aviation, and may include Military Sealift Command-provided ships and Air Force forces when appropriate. Also called ATF.”**

**Proposed Definition: “A Navy task organization formed to conduct amphibious operations. Together with the Landing Force and other forces constitutes the Amphibious Force.”**



# Definitions

## **Landing Force (DoD and NATO)**

**Current Definition: “A task organization of troop units, aviation and ground, assigned to an amphibious assault. It is the highest troop echelon in the amphibious operation. See also amphibious force.”**

**Proposed Definition: “A Marine Corps or Army task organization formed to conduct amphibious operations. Together with the Amphibious Task Force and other forces constitutes the Amphibious Force.”**